

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16 and 22-30 are in this application and are presented for consideration. By this amendment, Applicant has made revisions to each of the independent claims. Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to highlight that the diameter of the bolt is less than or equal to the inner diameter of the mount over the entire length of the bolt. Although the bolt need not have a constant diameter (there could be variations and there is the stop contact surface of the bolt providing a varied diameter) the diameter of the bolt is never larger than the inner diameter of the mount. It is this structure of the invention that allows the bolt to simply slip out of the mounts in the case of an accident. Other minor changes have been made to the claims to improve the form of the application. It is noted that the mount opening 6 and 5 refer to the openings of the mount generally (see for example Figure 3) and that the bearings 15 and 16 basically form parts of the overall mounting structure. This has been clarified in the claims such as claims 6, 14 and 22. It is believed that the minor changes to claim 22 do not affect the indication of patentability, the indication being made in the Office Action dated June 2, 2004.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Smith for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 2, 2004. During that time the Examiner noted that the finality of the rejection would be withdrawn and Applicant's representative noted that clarifying changes would be presented as presented by this amendment.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-15 have been rejected as being anticipated by BARTON et al. (U.S. 3,451,288).

Applicant's invention provides a combination of features including the means or

structure that allows the two mounts to be moved apart when the force of an accident is applied on the bearing block structure. Although Applicant agrees that the BARTON et al. structure may well be deformed during an accident, the BARTON structure is not the engineered structure which allows a movement of the mounts away as according to the invention. According to Applicant's invention this feature is combined with a bolt having overall dimensions or diameter which is smaller than the inner diameter of the mount such that the bolt can simply slip out of the assembled state of the assembly in the case of an accident. This is further combined with the features of the bolt being a two part structure which can be easily connected for ease of manufacture of the overall assembly. It is Applicant's position that this combination of features is neither taught nor suggestion by the prior art as a whole including BARTON et al. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejections particularly relating to independent claims 1 and 9 is requested. Other claims which depend on claims 1 and 9 should also be considered allowable.

Applicant has also presented new dependent claims 27-30 that highlight the combination as noted above and further the features that the engaging contour for the two piece bolt structure is provided in the region of the lever arm. This can be appreciated from Figure 1 wherein the region of the lever arm is over or at the zone of the connection. This combination of features is also clearly neither taught nor suggested by the prior art as a whole.

In summary, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the claims in view of the changes made by this amendment. Should the Examiner determine that any issues remain

which have not been resolved by this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney at the number given below such that all issues may be resolved at an early time.

Respectfully submitted
For Applicant,

By:



John James McGlew
Reg. No. 31,903
(914) 941-5600

JJM:jj/jms

Enclosed: Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038

70477RCE.4

DATED: September 2, 2004
SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-0827
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.